

## **REMARKS**

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

By way of this reply, claims 1, 13, 14, 18-20, 22-28 have been amended. Claims 1-28 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Barrett**

Claims 1-15, 18-20, and 22-28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2003/0135490 by Barrett et al. (“Barrett”). This rejection is traversed in view of the above amendment.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite:

A computer-implemented method for ranking information, comprising:  
determining a first ranking sequence of a collection of information including information retrieved from query results for a plurality of search queries;  
presenting the collection of information to a user according to the first ranking sequence;  
identifying an input signal from the user indicating an interest in a first piece of information in the collection of information;  
determining a first search query associated with a first query result including the first piece of information;  
adjusting a query factor associated with the first search query responsive to the input signal;  
locating a second piece of information in the query result of the search query;  
determining a score for the second piece of information based at least in part on the query factor associated with the search query;

determining a second ranking sequence of the collection of information based at least in part on the score; and  
presenting the collection of information to the user according to the second ranking sequence.

The method for ranking information recited in independent claim 1 is useful, for example, in reranking query results based on user responses to the query results.

Barrett, among other differences, does not disclose “determining a second ranking sequence of the collection of information based at least in part on the score.” Barrett, in contrast, discloses a method for determining an enhanced popularity score (EPS) and using it to rank information. See Barrett, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]. In Barrett, an EPS is created for a given piece of information and a given query. See Barrett, e.g., paragraph [0043], lines 10-12. The EPS is used to determine a score for the given piece of information in a query result of the given query (or similar queries). See Barrett, e.g., paragraph [0046]. Barrett teaches using the EPS to rank information related to a single query. See Barrett, e.g., paragraph [0041] (“The scores of information related to a particular query are compared and the associated information is ranked based on the score.”) Different from the claimed invention, Barrett does not *rerank* a query result based on user responses to the query result. Rather, Barrett uses the observed user responses to *previous* query results to calculate an EPS that is used to rank *subsequent* query results. See Barrett, FIG. 1, step 20, and paragraph [0012], lines 26-29. In addition, even if we assume the future search results recited in Barrett to be equivalent to the claimed collection of information, Barrett still fails to disclose that any of the future search results include “information retrieved from query results for a plurality of search queries” as claimed.

The Examiner cited FIG. 1, step 20 and FIG. 2 of Barrett for disclosure of “ranking the collection of information based on the score” as previously recited by independent claim 1. Step 20 of FIG. 1 recites “ranking *future* search results based on historical data collected.” See Barrett, FIG. 1 (emphasis added). FIG. 2 illustrates an index of information containing EPS’s and original scores for different combination of information and queries. The cited figures and corresponding descriptions of Barrett do not disclose or suggest reranking information retrieved from query results for a plurality of search queries. Therefore, Barrett fails to disclose the above-cited claim features.

In view of the above, Barrett fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons discussed above. Independent claims 18 and 25, and the dependent claims, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Barrett and Corston-Oliver**

Claims 16, 17, and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Barrett in view of U.S. Patent 6,295,529 to Corston-Oliver et al. (“Corston-Oliver”). This rejection is traversed in view of the above amendment.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from independent claim 1, and dependent claim 21 depend from independent claim 18. As argued above, Barrett fails to disclose “determining a second ranking sequence of the collection of information based at least in part on the score” as recited by independent claim 1. Corston-Oliver similarly fails.

Corston-Oliver describes a system for determining a relationship between a first textual input and a second textual input. The Corston-Oliver system identifies clauses in the first textual input and determines the relationship based on the identified clauses. Corston-Oliver is not related to reranking a collection of information based on a score determined based on a user input signal. Therefore, Corston-Oliver does not teach or suggest the claimed elements that Barrett fails to disclose.

In view of the above, Barrett and Corston-Oliver, whether considered singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Barrett and Corston-Oliver for at least this reason. Independent claims 18 and 25, and the dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

## **Conclusion**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-28, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Stephen R. Lawrence, et al.

Date: March 14, 2008

By: /Jie Zhang/

Jie Zhang, Reg. No.: 60,242  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (650) 335-7297  
Fax: (650) 938-5200